

Budgeting for Results Strategic Plan

April 27, 2012



Introduction

The State of Illinois is in the beginning stages of implementing a comprehensive Budgeting for Results (BFR) process to change the way it allocates over \$33 billion per year in general revenue spending. Prior to the signing of this law in July 2010, Illinois utilized a traditional, incremental budgeting approach, in which the current year's budget served as the baseline for development of the next year's spending proposal. Budgeting for Results is a strategic alternative to incremental budgeting, in which resources are allocated based on how effectively a program or service achieves established goals and objectives rather than historical funding levels.

Implementation of BFR will be a multi-year process to identify, develop and execute the structures and processes that will lead to an outcomes-based budget. As with any new system, this will require resources and knowledge that the state may not currently have. This strategic plan reflects our understanding of the activities needed to implement BFR at this time. In this document we have identified where additional resources and/or expertise would be helpful, however the timelines assume implementation will move forward with existing resources only. This plan will be updated as our understanding of BFR, and availability of outside resources, evolves.

Mission/Vision/Value Statements

The mission of the BFR implementation team is to implement a comprehensive Budgeting For Results process in Illinois that incorporates all of the components necessary to determine funding priorities, assess program performance, inform decision making, and deliver results for the people of Illinois.

Our vision is to be a state in which agencies have the tools they need to collect, track and assess program performance and in which funding, policy and contracting decisions are based on the quality and return on investment of publicly-funded programs.

We believe the people of Illinois deserve the best value for their taxpayer dollars, and quality services that deliver the intended results.

Organizational Description

The State of Illinois is the fifth largest state with over 12.8 million people, a gross state product of \$652 billion and an operating budget of over \$33 billion general revenue funds in FY'2012. The State government has over 51,000 employees working in nearly 50 agencies reporting directly to the Governor. Faced with increasing budget pressures, such as growing pension, healthcare and debt obligations, and diminishing state revenues, Governor Quinn recognized the need to begin addressing the structural deficits in Illinois' budget. First, the Governor signed a prospective

pension reform into law that is projected to reduce Illinois' actuarial accrued liability by \$200 billion over the next several decades. Next, the Governor signed a temporary tax increase to provide additional revenue to help cover the state's structural deficit of expenses consistently in excess of revenues. Third, the Governor signed Budgeting for Results into law, to help inform the difficult budget decisions that must be made to get our fiscal house in order.

Governance Structure

Budgeting for Results is a fundamental change that will impact all levels of state government as well as organizations that receive funding from state agencies. The governance structure for BFR must recognize and account for this complexity.

A bi-partisan Budgeting for Results Commission, comprised of state legislators, business and academic leaders and experts in state budgets and fiscal policy, was created by statute and appointed by Governor Quinn in August 2011. The Commission was created to advise the Governor and General Assembly on the implementation of a budgeting for results process in creating the Governor's introduced budget and throughout the appropriations process.

The Governor's Office of Management and Budget is the lead agency responsible for implementing Budgeting for Results in the Executive Branch of state government. In this role, GOMB will coordinate statewide adoption of BFR across all Executive Branch

agencies. GOMB has established a BFR Team to lead implementation efforts and will recruit a Chief Performance Officer to lead this project on a full-time basis.

At the agency level, each state agency Director has identified a person to be the BFR point of contact responsible for implementing BFR within their respective agencies. This person will attend all BFR training sessions and meetings, work in collaboration with their agency's senior leadership, budget staff and performance management staff to ensure appropriate BFR processes are in place, and report performance metric data to the Director of GOMB and the Chief Performance Officer on a regular basis.

BFR Process

There are seven main steps in the budgeting for results process. Below we outline our goals and strategies under each step. It is important to note that these steps are not necessarily linear. The BFR Implementation Team will engage in them according to the timeline provided in Appendix A.

Step 1: Identify available resources

Budgeting for Results begins by identifying the resources "available" in the coming fiscal year rather than the resources "needed." For the process to be successful, revenue forecasts must be reliable. Reliable revenue forecasts instills confidence in stakeholders that programs

will not be cut unnecessarily due to faulty revenue forecasting.

State source tax revenue forecasting is an ongoing process or cycle. The following steps outline the annual revenue forecasting cycle.

December

1. Department of Employment Security (DES) economists forecast employment for Illinois in the coming fiscal year.
2. Department of Revenue (DOR) adjusts wage and salary forecasts from IHS Global Insight based on DES employment forecasts.
3. DOR economists run econometric models for each tax source to determine expected revenues for the coming fiscal year.
4. DOR/DES economists present results to the Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) and Governor's Office of Management and Budget (GOMB). The underlying economic assumptions are discussed by the CEA. Once revenue forecasts are approved they will become part of GOMB's three year forecast.

January

5. DOR/DES updates data and re-runs models with new tax data from January estimated payments and input on assumptions from CEA.
6. DOR/DES economists present results to the CEA and GOMB. Revenue forecasts are approved and become part of the Governor's Budget Book.

May

7. DOR/DES updates data and re-runs models with new tax data from April final payments, estimated final payments and estimated payments.
8. DOR/DES economists present results to the CEA and GOMB to decide whether or not to revise revenue forecasts before a budget is passed by the General Assembly.

October

9. DOR/DES updates data and re runs models with new tax data from the first quarter of the fiscal year.
10. DOR/DES economists present results to the CEA and GOMB to decide whether or not the revenue forecasts presented in the budget are still reasonable.

Step 2: Identify priority areas

A results-based budget is built around a set of strategic priorities. These priorities must be expressed in terms of the results or outcomes that are of value to the public. As part of the FY 2012 budget, Governor Quinn established six priority areas for Illinois, representing the major functions and responsibilities of state government. All state government spending was grouped into one or more of these major priority areas. The BFR Commission then reviewed the six Results and made several recommendations to make them more outcome-focused. The seven Result areas for Illinois are as follows:

- Result 1: (Government Services): Illinois state government operates efficiently and transparently.
- Result 2: (Education): Illinois has a quality education system that provides equal opportunity for growth for all Illinois students.
- Result 3: (Economic Development): Illinois' economy provides sufficient opportunities for residents to achieve economic well-being.
- Result 4: (Public Safety): Illinois has adequate public safety mechanisms and infrastructure in place to protect the lives, safety and property of residents.
- Result 5: (Healthcare): All Illinois residents have access to quality, affordable health care.
- Result 6: (Human Services): Illinois assures that all residents, but particularly children, the elderly and the disabled, are able to experience a quality life.
- Result 7: (Quality of Life): Illinois maintains quality cultural and environmental resources for Illinois residents and visitors.

Step 3: Build a program inventory

Programs at the agency level are the unit of analysis for Budgeting for Results; therefore program identification is vital to successful implementation. Because traditional budgeting is based on line items and funds, rather than programs, there has never been a need to compile information at the program level. Budget for Results fundamentally changes this dynamic.

Agencies were asked to self-identify programs and submit them to GOMB via the Budget Book system by April 1, 2012. GOMB will review the submitted programs and verify that they are appropriate and amenable to measurement. A program must be broad enough to capture the tasks that go into producing a result but not be too vague or encompass too much as to undermine measurement efforts. It is expected that the process of program identification will take some time and refinement as GOMB analysts and agencies develop the appropriate parameters.

Step 4: Evaluate Programs against priority Results

Measuring the performance of state programs and evaluating their success in achieving results is an essential element of BFR. In order to do this, a process must be developed to objectively evaluate how a program achieves or influences an established Result.

There are often two types of evaluations discussed in Budgeting for Results. The first is an evaluation of program effectiveness. This refers to evaluating a program against established metrics to determine if it is achieving results. The SMART evaluation discussed below is designed for this type of evaluation.

The second is an evaluation of program impact compared to other programs, often referred to as Return on Investment. This is a much more in-depth evaluation that requires robust, state-specific, data sets. As

an example, advocates for a program might cite national studies that indicate \$1 invested in the program saves taxpayers \$xx in future costs. However, those studies cannot speak to whether an Illinois program is of comparable quality or achieves similar returns on investment. This type of evaluation requires a sophisticated method of isolating the various programs that contribute to a given Result and determining how effective they are in achieving their goals. The Results First initiative discussed below is a promising model for this type of evaluation, but implementing such a process would be a long-term goal.

Step 5: Compare scores between programs

A key goal of Budgeting for Results is to inform budgetary and programmatic decision making. BFR should allow the state to invest resources in programs found to be effective in achieving desired outcomes, and inform policy decisions about programs that are not as effective in producing results.

Step 6: Allocate Resources

Once evaluations are conducted and programs scored, a process must be put in place to assign funding allocations based on available resources, established priorities, and performance toward goals.

Step 7: Create accountability for program results

The ultimate success of Budgeting for Results depends on the extent to which it is used to inform decision-making. BFR must

be fully integrated into the state budgeting process, and officials must carry out their decision-making responsibilities in a way that is consistent with BFR principles. Further, because BFR is an ongoing process rather than a one-time event, it is critical that agencies be held accountable for performance year round, not just during budget development.

BFR Implementation

Implementation of BFR requires that GOMB create the structure and systems necessary to fully integrate the above steps into the budgeting process. The initial focus of the BFR Team has been to lay the foundation for this structure. GOMB has implemented Steps 1 – 3: developing a process to identify available resources, establishing the seven priority areas, and building a program inventory, and has begun building IT infrastructure, and developing tools to evaluate program performance. While this work must continue, GOMB must also begin building the structures for the remaining steps in the BFR process.

Develop and Refine Goals/Subgoals

In a BFR process, budget allocations should be based on the success of programs in contributing to the measurable achievement of established goals. Thus, measurable goals and sub-goals must be developed under each of the seven priority areas. There are certain principles that should be kept in mind when developing performance goals.

- Quality over quantity. Performance goals should be relevant to the core mission of the program and to the result the program is intended to achieve. This generally argues for quality over quantity, with a focus on a few good measures. However, programs should not feel compelled to collapse complex activities to a single measure, particularly if that measure is a proxy for the true objective.
- Importance to budget decisions. Performance goals should provide information that helps make budget decisions. Agencies can maintain additional performance goals to improve the management of the program, but they do not need to be included in the BFR process.
- Public clarity. Performance goals should be understandable to the users and the public of what is being measured.
- Feasibility. Performance goals should be feasible, but not the path of least resistance. Choose performance goals based on the relevancy of the outcomes and not for other reasons -- not because you have good data on a less relevant measure, for example. If necessary, terminate less useful data collections to help fund more useful ones.
- Collaboration. Agencies and their partners (e.g. grantees, contractors) need to work together in developing meaningful, measurable performance goals.

For the FY '13 budget, the BFR implementation team, in collaboration with the BFR Commission, state agency staff and the Governor's Office, developed a preliminary list of goals and subgoals for each of the seven priority area. Each

agency was asked to review this list and identify which goals and subgoals their programs helped to achieve. The goals, and associated state programs, were included in the FY'13 budget book. The BFR Team is pursuing several strategies to refine these goals for FY'14.

Strategy Mapping

The BFR Team is working with the Government Finance Officers Association to conduct a Strategy Mapping Process to refine the state's goals and subgoals based on the five principles mentioned above.

Strategy Mapping is a process used in Budgeting for Results to identify the underlying causes or factors that drive the strategic goals of an organization (in this case, the State), and inform decisions about what investments to make to achieve those goals. This process allows decision-makers to think about which activities drive desired outcomes rather than how current activities fit within established goals.

There are three main steps to strategy mapping

1. Identify desired outcomes/results;
 - a. Illinois has seven established Result areas;
2. Create Strategy Mapping Teams around each Result;
 - a. Teams should be no more than 7 – 10 people, and should include “thought leaders” as well as subject matter experts.

3. Conduct a cause & effect analysis for each Outcome;
 - a. Define the Problem
 - b. Identify factors that drive desired Outcome
 - c. Gather Intelligence/Research/Best Practices
 - d. Identify which activities can drive desired result
 - e. Determine which of those activities are/should be a function of State Government
 - f. Prioritize those activities when establishing Goals and Subgoals.

This process will result in a strategy map for each priority area that includes primary and secondary causal factors, a small number of performance indicators for each goal, key strategies for pursuing each goal, and a narrative description of the cause and effect analyses that produced each map, including sources of evidence.

By looking broadly at the factors that drive a desired outcome, Strategy Mapping holds promise for helping to break down programmatic silos and address concerns about state agencies being held accountable for outcomes when they don't control all of the factors that drive a given outcome.

Logic Modeling

Logic modeling is a system of conceptualizing a program and displaying it visually, which allows for a better understanding of how a program works.

Logic modeling asks basic questions about a program, such as: Who or what is the program intended to impact? What are the immediate intended results of the program activities? What are the outcomes generated from program activity? Logic modeling clarifies the necessary components that allow a program to function and simplifies development of performance measures.

The goal is to complete the logic model training program by June 2012 and begin training agency staff by the end of that month. All agencies will be asked to complete a rudimentary logic model of each of their programs by October 15, 2012. GOMB will provide technical assistance to agencies in completing this task.

Develop BFR Metrics

State agencies collect a vast amount of data, but current metrics tend to measure outputs rather than outcomes. Under BFR, it is the State's intention to develop program metrics that will measure the impact of programs on achieving their stated goals.

Through the process of completing logic models, agencies will have identified the various components that comprise each program, including resources, activities, and the various output measures that are currently collected. With that information in hand, consultants will engage with the agency program staff to identify new measures that will more accurately reflect the program's progress toward meeting the

state's prioritized outcomes. This review will be in-depth and program specific, and as a result will take multiple calendar years to complete. We also recognize that this process will be more complex for those agencies that accomplish their work through providers, contractors or grantees, and will need to gather data for performance metrics from these external entities. Agencies will be directed to establish a public process for gathering input from providers and stakeholders in developing performance metrics and making refinements as needed.

This process would be greatly aided by consultants with the technical expertise to assist in the development of measurable, result-oriented metrics as well as IT consultants to assist with agency implementation of the data collection and aggregation/analysis of metric data. Once new result-oriented performance measures are established, the data collected will be entered into the Budgeting for Results Performance Reporting data system, where it can be analyzed and used to inform policy decision.

We understand that state grantees and providers currently track and report a variety of metrics for their state, federal government and foundation-funded programs. We are sensitive to the administrative burden these reporting requirements place on grantees. In BFR our goal is to make sure state agencies are measuring what matters. State agencies will be asked to review the data they

collect, streamline reporting requirements and eliminate duplicative or otherwise unnecessary metrics that do not contribute to evaluating program outcomes.

Evaluate Programs

There are hundreds of state programs, and it will not be feasible for GOMB or agencies to evaluate them all in a single year. GOMB is currently prioritizing programs for and developing a timeline for completing evaluations. Once this is complete, we will need a process for compiling the data into a user-friendly format and utilizing it to evaluate program performance and make policy decision.

Strategic Management Accountability Reporting Tool

GOMB, with assistance from Patrick Mullen, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Public Administration and Policy at the University of Illinois Springfield, has developed a Strategic Management Accountability Reporting Tool (SMART) to assess performance of state programs. SMART is based on the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), which was developed by the federal Office of Management and Budget and the U.S. General Accountability Office (GAO) to assess the effectiveness of federal programs.

SMART is a 10-part questionnaire that will be completed by GOMB analysts with agency input. The questionnaire asks weighted yes and no questions about program metrics, inputs, outputs and

impacts. The resulting scores are tallied and the program rated on its effectiveness. The SMART questionnaire will be finalized by May 2012. GOMB analysts will then need to be trained in the SMART begin conducting SMART evaluations in calendar year 2013. Once complete, SMART evaluations will then be used to help determine resource allocations for the Governor's budget proposals.

Program Scoring Tool

Through BFR, the state will not only evaluate programs against established metrics but also against similar programs in order make informed decisions about which programs are most effective in achieving the desired outcomes. The SMART scores will be one component of this evaluation but a scoring system must also be developed to account for expected return on investment as well as policy and legal considerations. Once the programs are scored, the scores will be compiled, revealing a top-to-bottom comparison of programs that can be used to allocate resources. It will be necessary to engage consultants with the technical expertise to develop scoring criteria that can account for and appropriately weight program effectiveness, mandatory/statutory activities, policy priorities and return on investment.

Create Performance Management Process

Accountability for performance is a key tenet of Budgeting for Results, and represents a significant culture change not

only for state agencies but also state leadership. It is important to begin fostering a performance culture as soon as possible.

Beginning in July 2012, GOMB analysts, Deputy Chiefs of Staff, the Governor or his designee and the Chief Performance Officer will conduct regular Budgeting for Results meetings with agencies to review agency expenditures and performance toward key metrics and goals. These meetings will also provide a forum for refining goals/metrics and tracking agency-level implementation of budgeting for results.

GOMB is in the process of developing a Performance Reporting System (PRS) to begin collecting the data needed to inform Budgeting for Results. Current performance reporting solutions lack sufficient analytic capacity and user-friendly interface to meet BFR needs. In order to move forward, GOMB determined it would need to develop and implement a new performance reporting solution. The PRS is one step toward that solution.

GOMB is also developing a performance management website, modeled after Virginia Performs, to ensure metrics are transparent and accessible to the public. The website should launch by June 2012. Initially the information provided on the website will be basic, however the intent is to begin populating it with metric data from the PRS once that system is up and running.

Results First

Illinois is partnering with the Pew Center on the States in their Results First initiative. Through this initiative, Pew has helped states assess the costs and benefits of policy options, and use data to make decisions based on expected return on investment. Results First is based on four elements of policy decision-making:

- **Use the best information.** Pew helps states calculate costs and outcomes associated with various policy options.
- **Design policies that work together as a total package.** Pew helps policy makers quantify how investments or cuts in one program affect other costs and outcomes.
- **Learn from other states.** Pew provides information about proven practices and tools, as well as real-world approaches that other states have used to identify and build support for policies that get the best value for the investment.
- **Create the climate needed to make decisions based on results.** Pew helps state leaders build the political will both to adopt policies and programs that are most likely to produce the greatest success in the most cost-effective way and to reform or eliminate those that are not.

Participating in Results First will give Illinois access to additional resources that could help make our BFR process more robust.

Messaging and Public Engagement

One of the many benefits of BFR is its potential to help the public understand the value they get for their taxpayer dollars. Achieving this requires a robust communications and public engagement strategy.

The BFR Team has worked throughout the past few months to engage interested stakeholders and ensure they have a voice in the process. The BFR Commission held two public hearings and public comments/testimony received was included as an appendix in the BFR Commission's report. In addition, the BFR Commission Chairman, Sen. Dan Kotowski, and Governor's Office representatives have met with a variety of stakeholders throughout the BFR process. However, we recognize that there is much more that needs to be done, as the work of developing metrics and evaluating programs moves forward and communicating the performance and outcomes of programs once data is collected and evaluated.

The foundation community has expressed interest in working with the state and the BFR Commission to develop a public engagement process for Budgeting for Results. We envision that this would include a website, public meetings, focus groups, and direct communication strategies such as public service messages.

Operational Challenges and Needs

Budgeting for Results is a fundamental change in the way Illinois develops its budget, manages its agencies, and makes decisions about allocation of resources. It will impact all levels of state government as well as organizations that receive funding from state government. Implementation is a major undertaking for the State and there are several challenges that must be recognized and addressed as we move forward.

While the end-product of a results-based budget is a user-friendly document that simplifies spending decisions, implementation and management of a BFR process is a complex undertaking that cannot be accomplished in one budget cycle. As discussed in this document, BFR will require changes in IT, procurement, budget and grant/contract management processes across state agencies and numerous state-funded entities. It is important to manage expectations as BFR rolls out, both for proponents who want to see this process utilized more quickly and those concerned about what it will mean for their programs/funding streams. The state must develop a clear message and communications plan for the public as well as a robust community engagement process.

Stakeholder/Provider Engagement

Stakeholder “buy-in” will be vital to the success of budgeting for results. It will also be important to manage expectations as

BFR rolls out, both for proponents who want to see this process utilized more quickly and those who are concerned about what BFR will ultimately mean for their programs and funding streams. Because any decision to reduce or eliminate program funding is controversial for those who have a vested interest in those programs it is important that the BFR process have enough credibility to withstand the inevitable resistance. Therefore we will need to strike the right balance between engaging stakeholders vested in specific policy areas and independent experts in developing goals, metrics and evaluation or scoring tools.

While the BFR process focuses on how state resources are allocated to state agencies, much of the work of state government is done by private entities under grants and contracts. Thus, in order to evaluate the effectiveness of many state programs, an agency must be able to evaluate the services provided by private grantees or vendors.

For this reason BFR will need to be implemented not only across state government, but across the thousands of grantees and contractors that administer public programs or provide direct services on behalf of the state. There will need to be a mechanism for these entities to report performance metrics to the state, and for the state to evaluate their performance against other service providers. Therefore, Budgeting for Results assumes an increased use of performance-based contracting, where contracts outline specific outcome measures and payment depends on vendor performance in the achieving those

outcomes. Performance based contracting will inject accountability into the process by enabling agencies to make informed decisions within their allocated budgets. By incentivizing efficiency and rewarding performance, BFR and performance based contracting could enable agencies to reduce budgets without compromising services or reducing quality.

While some state agencies have made great strides in implementing performance-based contracts, many of these contracts are based on output measures rather than true outcome measures. There is a need for significant education and training, of both state agency staff and contractors, for successful implementation of performance-based contracting as it is envisioned for BFR. GOMB will need to engage consultants with the technical expertise necessary to help agencies develop and implement performance-based contracts. Resources are also needed to do sufficient outreach and education to the numerous providers and contractors that will be impacted by the shift from traditional to performance-based contracting.

Technical Expertise

Since Illinois is new to Budgeting for Results it is reasonable to expect that state agencies do not have the internal capacity needed to fully implement a BFR process. We have highlighted in this document areas where additional resources or expertise may be needed. The Governor's Office and GOMB is specifically seeking partners with expertise in performance measurement, program evaluation and logic modeling assist with the following tasks:

- Strategy Mapping
- Metric development
- Technical Assistance to agencies in developing provider level metrics for performance-based contracting
- Developing program evaluation and scoring tools
- Staff Training; and
- Performance Management, including a more focused and effective agency management process.

Information Technology

An integrated data collection and analysis system is needed to make BFR a success. In order to conduct the necessary performance measurement and program evaluation, the BFR implementation team will need to collect vast amounts of data from across over 50 state agencies, boards, commissions and vendors. Once the data is collected it will need to be analyzed and converted into useful, information.

Currently GOMB is attempting to build out a SharePoint-based data gathering solution that will allow for better collection and analysis of data. However, additional capacity is necessary to accomplish the broader goals. In addition, the BFR implementation team requires assistance acquiring software solutions for data visualization and analysis to support BFR implementation in the short-term. In the long-term, we will require assistance in establishing a more robust data gathering and analysis system capable of gathering

data from multiple programs from within multiple agencies, each with their own esoteric data formats and system requirements. This is the key IT challenge associated with BFR

GOMB will need to engage IT consultants to help complete the BFR Performance Reporting System, and conduct user training. GOMB expects to complete development of the BFR PRS by July 2012. Data currently on the GOMB PRS will be transferred to BFR PRS. Agency staff will be trained on the new system between July – September 2012. By November 1, 2012, all agencies that currently report metrics via the GOMB Performance Reporting System will report metrics via the BFR Performance reporting system (BFR PRS).

Change Management

Change Management is a critical component for ensuring successful implementation of any major organizational change. In addition, successful BFR implementation requires a culture change in how the budget is developed, and how appropriation decisions are made. It is important for Illinois to build the political will in both the Executive and Legislative branches to fund programs that produce

the greatest success in the most cost-effective way and to reform or eliminate those that do not.

Because BFR will impact employees throughout state government, it will be important to address the “human side” of this change to minimize resistance. Staff must understand and feel comfortable about what is happening, why the change is needed and what it means for them. It is also important that staff see high-level support for BFR, from the Governor and his leadership team to agency Directors and “champions” at all organizational levels. Government often struggles with change management and we would benefit from assistance in this aspect of the BFR project.

Conclusion

Governor Quinn is committed to improving transparency and accountability in state government, and has embraced Budgeting for Results as a key strategy toward achieving that goal. BFR represents a significant opportunity for the State of Illinois to restore public trust by helping people better understand how taxpayer dollars are spent and the return on investment of that spending.

Appendix I: BFR Timeline/Workplan

Below is a timeline for Calendar Year 2012 implementation of Budgeting for Results. BFR is a complex process involving both systems and culture change. As a result, full implementation will take several years. This strategic plan will be updated on an annual basis as we continually evaluate where we are in the implementation process and what steps and resources are needed in the upcoming year.

April 2012

- Agencies complete self-identification of programs
- Procure vendor(s) for Strategy Mapping and Logic Model Training
- Conduct Agency Director and Senior Staff training on BFR

May 2012

- SMART questionnaire finalized
- Finalize logic model training program for agency staff

June 2012

- Begin training agency staff on logic modeling.
- Begin Strategy Mapping Process
- GOMB reviews list of programs submitted by agencies and verifies they are appropriate and amenable to measurement.
- GOMB completes development of the BFR Performance Reporting System.
- GO and GOMB begin BFR Performance Management meetings with agency leadership using goals identified in FY'13 Budget Book.

July 2012

- Data currently on the GOMB PRS transferred to the BFR PRS
- Agency staff trained on the BFR PRS
- Complete Strategy Maps

October 2012

- All agencies complete rudimentary logic models of each of their programs.
- GOMB sends FY'14 Budget Instructions to Agencies

November 1, 2012

- All agencies currently reporting metrics via the GOMB PRS will report metrics via the BFR PRS.
- GOMB compares performance metrics to inform FY'14 proposed budget.
- GOMB SMART training.

Calendar Year 2013 and beyond

- Data from logic modeling used to develop program metrics
- GOMB SMART implementation.
- Agencies conduct stakeholder engagement process on program metrics
- Develop Balanced Scorecard or other performance management tool using updated metrics
- Agencies begin reporting on new metrics
- Allocate resources for FY'14 proposed budget